R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 016 708 UD 004 454

STATE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT FOR PREVIOUS FISCAL YEAR 1965-1966--ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, 1965, TITLE I.

RHODE ISLAND STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION, PROVIDENCE

PUB DATE 16 DEC 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$2.04 49P.

DESCRIPTORS- *FEDERAL PROGRAMS, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, ANNUAL REPORTS, STATE AGENCIES, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, TABLES (DATA), EVALUATION METHODS, PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION, INTERAGENCY COOPERATION, PROGRAM BUDGETING, INFORMATION DISSEMINATION, COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS, PRIVATE SCHOOLS, PERSONNEL POLICY, INNOVATION, MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS, ESEA TITLE 1, RHODE ISLAND

THE RHODE ISLAND DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ADMINISTERED ITS ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT TITLE I PROGRAMS THROUGH A SPECIALLY ESTABLISHED OFFICE WHICH SERVED THE LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES. THE TITLE I COORDINATOR INFORMED LOCAL UNITS OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE ACT AND PROVIDED CONSULTANTS TO HELP IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROPOSALS. EVALUATION GUIDELINES WERE DEVELOPED BY THE STATE, BASED ON FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS. MOST PROJECTS (22) USED A PRE- AND POSTTEST DESIGN TO COMPARE EXPECTED GAINS WITH OBSERVED GAINS AND LOSSES. THE MAJOR ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS WERE THE DELUGE OF PROPOSALS TO BE REVIEWED IN A SHORT TIME AND THE CONFUSION OF THE LOCAL LEVEL ABOUT THE ACT'S PROVISIONS. LACK OF SUFFICIENT PERSONNEL ON BOTH STATE AND LOCAL LEVELS WAS ANOTHER PROBLEM. LOCAL DISTRICTS ALSO HAD DIFFICULTIES IN USING EVALUATION METHODOLOGY. ON THE WHOLE, COOPERATION BETWEEN COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS AND LOCAL AGENCIES WAS GOOD, BUT CLEARER DELINEATION OF THE RESPONSIBILITIES AND OBLIGATIONS OF EACH UNIT IS FELT TO BE IMPORTANT. IN GENERAL LOCAL AGENCIES FELT THAT THEY SHOULD HAVE GREATER DISCRETION ABOUT THE ALLOCATION OF THEIR FUNDS, A POSTION WHICH REFLECTS A WISH FOR A GENERAL RATHER THAN A CATEGORICAL AID BILL. COOPERATIVE PROJECTS BETWEEN PUBLIC AND NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS WORKED SUCCESSFULLY. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ACADEMIC REMEDIATION PROGRAMS WAS THE MAJOR FUNDED ACTIVITY. THE DOCUMENT CONTAINS THE REQUIRED COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF THE PROJECTS' ACTIVITIES, STAFF RECRUITMENT METHODS, EVALUATION MEASURES, AND DATA ON PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS, ATTENDANCE, AND DROPOUT RATES. (NH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED016708

071454

F60958ES

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

ROGER WILLIAMS BUILDING

Hayes Street, Providence, Rhode Island

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

1965 - Title I

STATE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT FOR PREVIOUS FISCAL YEAR

1965-1966

December 16, 1966

UD004454

WILLIAM P. ROBINSON, JR.
COMMISSIONER

ARTHUR R. PONTARELLI
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

GRACE M. GLYNN
ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

EDWARD T. COSTA
Consultant on Compensatory Education

LENORE DELUCIA
Consultant on Evaluation

TABULAR DATA

(a) Related to project objectives regarding the five most commonly funded Title I Projects in Rhode Island could not be compiled from the LEA's evaluation report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

		Page
1.	Operation and Services	1.
2.	Dissemination	2.
3.	Evaluation	3.
4.	Major Problem Areas	6.
5.	Implementation of Section 205	8.
6.	Coordination of Title I and Community Action Programs	10.
7.	Inter-Relationship of Title I with other Title of ESEA	13.
8.	Cooperative Projects between Districts	14.
9.	Non-Public School Participation	16.
10.	Supplementary Materials	19.

PART II COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS

1.	Statistical Information	21.
2.	Establishing Project Areas	21.
3.	Needs	21.
4.	Local Educational Agency Problems	21.
5.	Activities Funded	29.
6.	Innovative Projects	30.
7.	Methods of Increasing Staff for Title I Projects	31.
8.	Measuring Instruments	31.
9.	Analysis of Effective Activities and Methods	34.
10.	General Analysis of Title I	34.
PART III	TABULAR DATA	44.
APPENDIX		45.

1. OPERATION AND SERVICES:

Upon passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Rhode Island State Department of Education, established an office within the department to administer and service requests from local educational agencies for Title I funds.

In an effort to acquaint all local educational agencies with the purposes and provisions of the law, the Title I coordinator planned four statewide meetings at local colleges in the state. Invitations were extended to all superintendents and/or their representatives to attend these meetings. At the meetings the law and its provisions were discussed, all available literature on Title I was distributed, and the process of making application for Title I funds was explained. The Title I coordinator personally visited 96% of all the cities and towns in Rhode Island to confer with the local officials about their applications for federal funds.

The State Department of Education provided consultants to any LEA that requested such assistance. Consultant fees were paid from the Title I administration fund of the State Department of Education. Some consultants were on the State Department staff, others were from local colleges and universities, some were from the public schools themselves, and others were engaged in private medical practice. In many cases, consultants assisted in the initial planning operation, and/or evaluation of the projects. Consultants served in areas of reading, speech and hearing, special education, psychological services, in-service training, group dynamics, psychological testing, assessment, lanquage arts, curriculum development, secondary education, administration, kindergarten, preschool education, elementary education, guidance, social studies, parent aides parent education, education of the blind and emotionally disturbed, science edu-

education, mathematics education, and audiovisual communications.

Site visits were made frequently; however, not all projects were visited because of a lack of time and state department personnel. All LEA's that requested such visits and projects of special interest were visited by a team consisting usually of the SEA Title I coordinator, the consultant on evaluation and two or three others, usually one or two consultants in the field in which the project was operating, e.g. reading, or preschool education and one or two people from other LEA's that were operating projects in the same general area of instruction.

In April and May of 1966 the SEA prepared to assist the local schools with the evaluation of their projects. Guidelines for the preparation of the evaluation report were developed. All superintendents were requested to send their representative (hopefully the individual responsible for writing the LEA evaluation report) to one of two meetings scheduled in May. At these meetings the guidelines were distributed and reviewed by the consultant on evaluation. Both the consultant on evaluation and the SEA Title I coordinator were available at any time either in person or via the telephone to provide assistance to the LEA's in making their project evaluations.

All LEA's were provided with assistance in areas of instructional and fiscal activity, the latter by a Title I auditor who was added to the staff. At the initial general meetings on Title I the Chief of Administration and Finance Services reviewed procedures for keeping inventories, bookkeeping and auditing.

2. <u>DISSEMINATION</u>

(a) 1. LEA's disseminated Title I data to other LEA's by newsletter correspondence, formal presentation at area meetings, and through medium of newspapers, radio and television, and professional journals.

2. LEA's informed the State Department of Education through letters,

meetings, informal conferences, and required reports. LEA's also forwarded to the State Department of Education copies of news releases, articles submitted to professional journals, and pictures taken of Title I activities.

(b) An abstract of each project is prepared and sent to every newspaper and television and radio station in the state. Copies of these abstracts are also sent to all superintendents, principals, Title I coordinators, CAP directors, and consultants. In addition, a bi-monthly newsletter is currently distributed to inform LEA's of new Title I developments in Rhode Island, in Congress, and in the United States Office of Education. Many subject area consultants on the Department of Education staff regularly issue newsletters noting recent advances and news in their particular areas as related to Title I projects.
Various members of the State Department staff have spoken frequently to groups around the State about the purposes and activities of Title I projects.

3. EVALUATION:

(a) Guidelines

Federal Guidelines for the State Annual Evaluation Report were "translated" into State Guidelines for the LEA's to follow in writing their local reports. A copy of the State Guidelines as developed by Rhode Island is included in the Appendix.

The guidelines for evaluation were distributed at meetings held by the State Department of Education for representatives of all LEA's. The consultant on evaluation explained the procedure for completing this report and entertained all questions relevant to the evaluation. The consultant on evaluation and the Title I coordinator were available

following that meeting to assist all LEA's in the completion of their report.

(b) State personnel involved in evaluation

Mr. Edward Costa, Title I Coordinator

Dr. Lenore A. DeLucia, Consultant on Evaluation

Mrs. Marion L. McGuire, Consultant, Reading

(c) Consultants involved in evaluation

Dr. Robert Aukerman:	Professor Education University of Rhode Island
Mr. Leo Dolan:	Speech and Hearing Therapist Pawtucket School Department
Dr. Isobel Edwards:	Rhode Island College
Dr. Max Faintych:	Private Psychiatrist
Dr. John Finger:	Professor of Education Rhode Island College
Dr. Helen F. Kyle:	Professor of Education Rhode Island College
Dr. Thomas Moriarty:	Dean of the College of Education University of Rhode Island
Dr. Coleman Morrison:	Professor of Education Rhode Island College
Mrs. Eleanor McMahon:	Associate Professor Education Rhode Island College
Dr. Harry Novak:	Professor of Special Education Rhode Island College
Dr. Alfred Pascale:	Associate Professor of Guidance and Counselin University of Rhode Island
Dr. Marvin Rife:	Professor of Guidance and Counseling University of Rhode Island
Dr. Mary Thorpe:	Distinguished Professor Emeritus Rhode Island College

(d) Number of Projects employing each of the following evaluation designs

Number of Projects	Evaluation Design
0	Two group experimental design using the project group and a conveniently available non-project group as the control.
22	One group design using a pretest and posttest on the project group to compare observed gains or losses with expected gains.
17	One group design using pretest and/or posttest scores on the project group to compare observed performance with local, State, or national groups.
5	One group design using test data on the project group to compare observed performance with expected performance based upon data for past years in the project school.
11	One group design using test data on the project group, but no comparison data.
11	Other

Included in the "Other" category are projects reporting no assessment procedures in their evaluation reports and those projects which did not provide sufficient information to judge the nature of the evaluation design used.

4. MAJOR PROBLEM AREAS

(a) Major problems encountered by state in administering the Title I program:

1. Reviewing Proposals

A major problem faced by the office of the Title I Coordinator was the great number of proposals which needed review in a relatively short period of time. The problem was compounded by several other factors. One was the varied interpretations of the Act by the LEA's. A great deal of time which could have been spent more fruitfully in reviewing the project proposals was spent in clarifying the Act for the LEA's. Another factor was the unavailability of information needed to determine attendance areas eligible for Title I funds. In addition, many of the projects were poorly written and had to be returned to the LEA's for modification.

It may be emphasized that these problems were subsequently resolved as the SEA and LEA's became more familiar with the language of the Act, the LEA's became more adept at formulating projects, and needed information became available.

2. Operation and Service

A major problem in this area was the initial lack of clerical personnel to service the SEA and LEA's. SEA staff personnel had to be procured in accordance with existing state regulations, causing a delay in staffing the State Title I office. The LEA's were also faced with the problem of hiring qualified clerical personnel. In addition, there was a lack of staff to share the responsibilities of administering the Title I office and for providing consultive services for LEA's. Another problem in this area was posed by the unrealistic demands of the Community Action Agencies.

3. Evaluation

The average project director, often a classroom teacher, usually had a limited understanding of evaluation. One of the tasks of the State Department, was to acquaint the project director with the nature of evaluation and its role in making decisions about future project activities. Few had any acquaintance with the concepts of experimental design, the notion of antecedent-consequent relations, and the multudinous ways of measuring behavioral change. Although they were familiar with standardized tests commonly used in their school systems, they generally did not know how to find a standardized test for a particular purpose. More importantly, however, they had little or no knowledge of the role of non-standardized tests in evaluation.

Another related problem was attempting to get those in charge to choose or design their evaluation measures with an eye to the objectives of the program. For example, it was difficult for many of them to choose instruments to assess projects designed for cultural enrichment. Too often evaluation methods were used which did not assess the stated objectives of the program or assessed few of the objectives, usually the achievement objectives. Achievement objectives were usually fairly well measured; interest, attitudes or other behavioral changes were not.

(b) Recommendations for revising the legislation to alleviate these problems

Legislative action is not required to remedy the problems encountered in Rhode Island.

5. IMPLEMENTATION OF SECTION 205:

(a) Types of projects not initially approvable

Several projects, not at first approved, might be described as "all equipment - no program" projects. These projects generally committed a large portion of their allocation to purchasing new equipment and very little to salaries or in-service training. There was little emphasis placed on assessing children's need's. It was felt by some project reviewers that the influence of salesmen, especially major equipment salesmen, was manifested in "equipment loaded" project applications. It was noted that one school supply concern offered free copies of projects which were built around its product and which had been approved by other states. Such practices totally disregarded the specific needs of the students. Whenever such practices were suspected, the State Department requested local officials to substantiate and carefully document the existence of such needs.

Other projects not at first approvable were those whose scope was too broad. For example, one LEA originally designed a reading program for 20,000 elementary school children, or half of its entire elementary school population. Such a project could have served none of the pupils adequately.

(b) Common misconceptions of Title I purposes

Prior to the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 Rhode Island had received federal funds under the Anti-Poverty bill for the support of local Neighborhood Youth Corps. Some local official had been publicly and severely criticized for enrolling young people in this program who did not qualify by

virtue of their parents' income. Consequently, LEA officials presumed that only economically deprived children could participate in Title I projects in many instances were reluctant to seek Title I funds.

Another misconception of the purpose of Title I was that it was a general aid bill rather than a categorical aid bill. In many cases this misconception appeared to be based on an unwillingness to operate within the confines of a categorical aid bill. Many superintendents initially expressed dissatisfaction with the nature of the bill. This also may have been a reason for the submission of projects which were mainly proposals to buy equipment and supplies.

Another improtant misconception was that federal funds were not subject to local restrictions. For example, many eroneously believed that personnel hired for a Title I project did not have to fulfill state certification requirements. The fact that purchases had to be made under the same rules as all other local pruchasing was not originally well understood.

Some superintendents saw Title I as an opportunity to give pay raises to the project teachers. It was not originally understood that teachers in Title I projects must be paid "on scale"; they could not receive extra pay merely for teaching in this program.

Another misconception concerning personnel was that Title I teachers became State Department of Education employees and consequently the LEA's need not assume the responsibility for retirement, social security and tenure.

6. COORDINATION OF TITLE I AND COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

(a) Thirteen communities in Rhode Island had, at the inception of any Title I project, a Community Action Program. Those thirteen communities conducted thirty six (36) different Title I projects. Twenty communities have no CAPs conducted thirty-two (32) Title I projects.

(b) The total amount of Title I monies approved for communities having an approved Community Action Program was $2,404,110.35. The amount approved for communities having no CAP was $492,241.63. (See Table 8).

(c) Mr. Anthony J. Agostinelli, State Technical Assistance Office has made available to the State Department of Education a complete list of funded and non-funded Community Action Programs (C.A.P.) in the state of Rhode Island. The list specifies the geographical territories covered by L.E.A. Community Action Programs. This list is kept up to date as each change occurs.

When a project application for a Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act grant is submitted to the State Department of Education by an L.E.A. it can be determined from the C.A.P. list if such an agency, in fact, does exist in the locale covered by the L.E.A. If it does, the State Department of Education notifies the State Office of Economic Opportunity in writing. The notification is so detailed that by the nature of the proposal it is known whether cooperation did exist with the C.A.P.

The State Office of Economic Opportunity can assist on the level or kind of cooperation that exists between the L.E.A. and C.A.P. and report its findings to the Title I Office.

TABLE 8

TITLE I FUNDS:COMMITTED BY LEAS WITH AND WITHOUT CAPS

	City or Town with CAP and Title I Programs	City or Town with Title I Programs and No CAP
Barrington	$	$ 23,963.00
Bristol		53,281.13
Burrillville		26,526.59
CENTRAL FALLS		65,283.24
Charlestown		4,050.67
Chariho		7,192.15
CRANSTON	107,398.52	
Cumberland		29,123.00
East Greenwich		24,638.22
EAST PROVIDENCE	85,006.56	
Exeter-West Greenwich		14,796.20
Foster		3,876.15
Foster-Glocester		6,438.12
Glocester		4,165.71
Johnston	29,298.75	
Lincoln		21,931.84
Little Compton	4,087.09	
Middletown	70,722.71	
NEWPORT	218,093.38	
New Shoreham		3,656.50
North Kingstown		87,463.52
North Providence	20,260.36	
North Smithfield		6,363.30
PAWTUCKET	224,902.61	
Portsmouth	88,645.56	
PROVIDENCE	1,203,988.98	
Scituate		4,807.90
Smithfield		16,801.17
Tiverton	27,275.98	
Warren		35,950.00
WARWICK	134,919.06	
West Warwick		51,933.22
WOONSOCKET	189,510.79	
TOTAL	$2,404,110.35	$492,241.63

The procedure that is to be followed in the event that the C.A.P. has a major criticism concerning a proposal will be as outlined in a communication furnished by the Office of Education dated April 1, 1966; Subject: Local School System in Community Action Agency.

(d) Successes in securing CAP-LEA cooperation

Most LEA's reported little difficulty establishing a cooperative relationship with the local CAP. They consulted with the CAP prior to Title I application, received their approval and maintained a harmonious and working relationship thereafter.

(e) Problems in securing CAP-LEA cooperation

Other communities, however, reported problems of varying degree with the CAPs. More difficulty in securing this cooperation existed in the larger communities. Some reported that CAP review and subsequent project approval was unnecessarily delayed. This appeared due to staff and procedural problems on the part of the CAP and due also to a lack of understanding on both sides of the role of each agency. Both agencies, it was suggested, need a clearer delineation of their responsibilities and obligations to each other. One LEA expressed extreme dissatisfaction in having non-educators in the CAP jointly plan and eventually judge educational programs. The LEA's felt that since they had no reciprocal role in planning CAP programs, the CAP should have no role in planning LEA programs. This imbalance of power was expressed by one LEA: "They (CAP) expect Title I to relate to their programs, but not visa versa."

(f) Inter-relationship of the two programs

Only two communities reported an active inter-relationship of two programs at the local level. One reported that eligible target areas were mutually determined and subsequently used in programming both Title I and CAP projects. The other community conducted a Title I kindergarten coordinated with the local Headstart project.

(g) Suggestions for revising the legislation concerning CAP as it relates to Title I.

Interestingly enough, LEAs that reported no problems with the local CAP had suggestions for changes in the legislation concerning CAPs as they relate to Title I. All suggestions centered around the role assumed by the CAP as a planner and judge of educational programs. All LEAs that commented felt very strongly that this role belonged to the LEA exclusively. The nature of the local concern with this issue can best be illustrated with a few quotations from the evaluation reports of local education agencies in Rhode Island.

"Change the legislation to place the planning and control of educational programs for the poor entirely under the jurisdiction of local school departments."

"The most satisfactory location for education programs is the Department of Education. The Office of Economic Opportunity should administer aide programs only. OEO philosophy appears diametrically opposed to accepting state regulations governing certification of personnel assigned to supervise school programs and instructing school children."

"Legislation should restrict any emphasis on education programs by Community Action groups to prevent duplication of effort and creation of shortages of trained personnel to staff projects."

"All educational programs such as Head Start and Basic Adult Education should be transferred to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act because of the availability of professional competence in the field of education within the LEA, thus minimizing problems in initiating and implementing educational programs."

7. INTER-RELATIONSHIP OF TITLE I WITH OTHER TITLES OF ESEA

(a) Title II

Every community in Rhode Island received and used Title II funds to purchase library books, textbooks and other instructional materials. Many of those same communities operated remedial reading programs under Title I of the ESEA. All commented that the library resource material purchased under Title II was used on a supplemental basis with the remedial reading project.

(b) Title III

Some of the communities which were recipients of both Title I and Title III monies reported that many children were served under both Titles. One community reported that funds had been received under Title III to explore thepossibilities of county cooperation. This community administered a coo rative Title I project with its county neighbors this past summer. Another community reported that audio-visual equipment purchased with Title I funds has been used in accordance with a Title I project. That same LEA noted that work done originally for a Title I project alerted the professions to critical needs of children which might be served by a Title III project and that currently a Title III proposal is being written to fulfill one of these needs.

(c) Title IV

Title I funds are not being used with Title IV.

(d) Title V

New staff members added under Title V served as consultants for the LEA's and the state Title I coordinator.

(e) Successes in developing and implementing projects relating Title I with other Titles of ESEA. This is an area which needs further development. An example of a successful program of this type is cited. In one community which ran a summer library program, room renovations for use as a library were accomplished with Title I funds. The books were purchased with Title II funds.

(f) Problem areas involved in developing and implementing projects relating Title I with other Titles of ESEA.

The State Department of Education is not aware of any problem that cannot be overcome with more time and greater familiarity with the program.

(g) Suggestions for revising legislation

A few LEAs suggested changes in the legislation regarding Title III monies. It was suggested that the State have more control in assigning monies under Title III. In fact, it was suggested that they be given exercise over Title I.

A more general comment about all Titles of the Act was that the local educational agencies should be allowed more discretion in the disbursement of their funds. This reflects the wish for a general aid bill rather than a categorical aid bill which was discussed above (section 5b). One official commented that as a matter of policy, no public school program should be restrictive and he felt that those sponsored under ESEA were.

8. <u>COOPERATIVE PROJECTS BETWEEN DISTRICTS</u>

(a) Successes in developing and implementing cooperative projects.

There were within the State of Rhode Island two cooperative projects between two or more local districts. One project serviced mentally retarded children from two communities. The smaller of the two

communities regularly sends its mentally retarded children to classes in the larger community. It was logical, therefore, that a Title I project to serve these children should be a cooperative project with a combination of funds from the two communities.

The only other cooperative project in the State was conceived within the broader framework of the study of the effects of large military installations on the educational institutions of a community. Six communities were approached and asked to participate in both a Title I and a Title III project. Two communities had to decline because all its Title I funds for the year had been previously committed. One community refused to participate due to a misconception of the purposes of the bill.

Eventually, three communities entered into a successful cooperative Title I project in remedial reading and cultural enrichment activities. The superintendent of schools in the smallest of the three participating communities praised the cooperative program, saying that his school would never have been able to undertake so extensive a program alone.

(b) Problems in developing and implementing cooperative projects

Neither of the cooperative projects reported any problems resulting from the cooperative nature of their endeavors. They did suggest, however, that problems could exist. For example, problems might arise if the director and the staff of the project were chosen from only one of the participating communities. The project should have adequate representation from all participating LEAs.

(c) Suggestions for revising the legislation concerning cooperative projects between districts.

Two suggestions were made for revising the legislation concerning

cooperative projects between districts. Both were concerned with fiscal matters. One suggestion was that legislation might be developed that would make cooperative projects more attractive in terms of increased allotments to the participants such as the State gives to regional schools. Secondly, the legislation should provide for an easier means of transferring allotment funds from one cooperating community to another.

9. NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION:

(a) Steps taken to encourage initiative of local administrators in contacting non-public schools officials.

All project applications had to have a letter of concurrence from the Superintendent of Parochial Schools, Diocese of Providence, Rhode Island.

(b) Successes in developing and implementing public and non-public school cooperative projects.

Rhode Island public school officials have been enthusiastic about their relationship with non-public schools on Title I projects. This is best illustrated by quoting from the local evaluation reports. They describe the relationship as "excellent", "outstanding", "positive and enthusiastic", "most cooperative", "excellent personal interrelationship", "mutual respect", and informed".

(c) Problems in developing and implementing public and non-public school cooperative projects.

Only one community reported any problems whatsoever in implementing a public and non-public school cooperative project. This community was one with a very large non-public school population. The ratio

of public to non-public school children is about 50 - 50. A lack of personnel prevented an effective completion of project activities.

(d) Recommendations for revising the legislation concerning public and non-public school participation.

Only one community offered suggestions for revising the legislation concerning public and non-public school participation. The writer recommended "removing the 'back door' approach to non-public school participation in Title I."

e. NUMBER OF PROJECTS AND NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN PARTICIPATING BY TYPE OF FOLLOWING ARRANGEMENT

ervices or activities in which children attending schools participated:	No. of Projects	Number of Non-Public School Children participating*
On public school grounds only:		
During the regular school day	18	1253
Before school	0	0
After school	6	146
Weekends	2	79
Summer	22	1247
On non-public school grounds only:		
During the regular school day	1	23
Before School	0	0
After School	0	0
Weekends	0	0
Summer	0	0
On both public and non-public school grounds:		
During the regular school day	2	96
Before School	0	0
After School	2	120
Weekends	1	81
Summer	2	171
On other than public or non-public school grounds		
During the regular school day	1	0
Before School	0	0
After School	0	0
Weekends	0	0
Summer	0	0

*This figure is not an unduplicated count of children

10. SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

(a) State guidelines for implementing Title I programs

Rhode Island adopted the Federal Guidelines for project application and implementation.

(b) Evaluation contracts

The State Department of Education has not contracted with an outside agency for evaluation of its Title I projects. The local communities of Providence and Newport each contracted to have one of their projects evaluated by an outside source. Five copies of the Providence Project "GIRD" are enclosed. The Newport evaluation had not yet reached the State Department Office as of December 10, 1966 (The city of Newport did submit a locally completed evaluation report to satisfy the evaluation requirement). It will be forwarded when received.

Through arrangements with the New England Assessment Project, the New England Educational Data Systems completed some of the statistical analysis for this State evaluation report.

(c) Compilation of objective measurements of educational attainment for programs funded under Title I.

Based on the information received in the evaluation reports of LEA's it is impossible to compile such a list. Communities have not uniformly reported such data. Some have reported mean scores, others have reported degree of change from pre to post testing and others have not engaged in a pre-test, post-test design. Therefore, a group of projects reporting data in a similar way, with similar objectives, using the same standardized instrument and given at similar times does not exist in Rhode Island.

(d) Supply evaluation data on the previously submitted 10% sample of approved fiscal 1966 grants. (Sample will follow)

PART II

COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS

Every Local Educational Agency funded under Title I submitted an evaluation report. Therefore, this section represents 100% returns.

1. STATISTICAL INFORMATION

See Table 9. Table 16 in the Appendix represents a breakdown by individual LEA's of the data in Table 9.

Table 10 is an analysis of the discrepancy between the funds committed figure reported by each LEA in their evaluation report and the preliminary audit figure.

2. ESTABLISHING PROJECT AREAS:

The most widely used method for establishing project areas was census data. This method was used most frequently by all communities, regardless of their Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area designation. The next most frequently used methods were the Aid to Dependent Children statistics and other welfare statistics. A ranking of all possible methods of determining project areas is found in Table 11.

3. NEEDS:

In SMSAs A, B, C, and E the most pressing pupil needs were in the academic areas. In SMSA D the most pressing need was for cultural opportunities. Also high on the list of needs for all communities was instruction in language skills. A complete rank ordering of the needs of pupils served by the Title I projects in the five Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas is found in Table 12.

4. LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY PROBLEMS:

The most often mentioned problem of local officials in implementing their Title I projects was the lack of staff. More specifically, LEA's lacked elementary classroom teachers and elementary reading specialists. Other shortages mentioned were for psychologists, psychiatrists, and social workers. Another frequently cited serious problem was the inability to secure equipment and materials on time. LEA's were often required to initiate project activities

TABLE 9

STATISTICAL INFORMATION

Classification	No. of LEA's for which Title I programs have been approved	Funds Actually Committed	Unduplicated Count of children				Average cost per pupil
			Total	Public	Non-Public	Not Enrolled	
A	3	$1,563,810.65	9,736	7,531	1,669	536	$160.56
B	3	362,192.55	1,933	1,421	476	36	187.37
C	14	512,540.66	3,077	2,310	544	223	166.57
D	10	446,188.38	1,531	1,300	151	80	291.63
E	3	11,619.74	169	167	2	0	68.76
TOTAL	33	$2,896,351.98	16,446	12,729	2,842	875	$176.11

TABLE 10

FUNDS COMMITTED

DISCREPANCY BETWEEN AMOUNT REPORTED IN
EVALUATION REPORT AND
FINAL AUDITED FIGURE

Community	Reported in Evaluation	Final Audit	Discrepancy
Barrington	$ 27,114	$ 23,963	$ - 3,151
Bristol	54,919	53,281	- 1,637
Burrillville	26,454	26,527	+ 73
CENTRAL FALLS	71,273	65,283	- 5,990
Charlestown	4,096	4,051	- 45
Chariho	7,803	7,192	- 611
CRANSTON	107,399	107,399	0
Cumberland	29,123	29,123	0
East Greenwich	24,638	24,638	0
EAST PROVIDENCE	85,020	85,007	- 13
Exeter-West Greenwich	14,796	14,796	0
Foster	2,766	3,876	+ 1,110
Foster-Glocester	6,800	6,438	- 362
Glocester	4,166	4,165	- 1
Johnston	29,547	29,299	- 248
Lincoln	21,711	21,932	+ 221
Little Compton	4,506	4,087	- 419
Middletown	70,289	70,723	+ 434
NEWPORT	218,093	218,093	0
New Shoreham	3,656	3,656	0
North Kingstown	87,463	87,463	0
North Providence	23,189	20,260	- 2,929
North Smithfield	6,363	6,363	0
PAWTUCKET	224,902	224,903	+ 1
Portsmouth	93,880	88,646	- 5,234
PROVIDENCE	1,222,940	1,203,989	-18,951
Scituate	5,000	4,808	- 192
Smithfield	17,574	16,801	- 773
Tiverton	27,276	27,276	0
Warren	35,950	35,950	0
WARWICK	134,874	134,919	+ 45
West Warwick	51,937	51,933	- 4
WOONSOCKET	188,635	189,511	+ 876

TABLE 11

Rank Ordering* of Methods Used for Establishing Project Areas in the Five Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas

Methods	SMSA's A	B	C	D	E
Census data	1	1	1	1	1
Aid to Dependent Children	2	2	3	2	--
Welfare Statistics	-**	-	4	3	-
School Surveys	-	-	2	5	-
Health Statistics	-	-	-	6	2
Employment Statistics	-	3	8	-	-
Free School Lunch Data	-	-	7	-	-
Housing Statistics	-	-	-	8	-
Community Service Agency Records	-	4	6	7	-
Others	3	5	5	4	3

* 1 = most frequently used method

** A blank indicates that no LEA in the SMSA used that method of establishing project areas.

TABLE 12

Rank Ordering of Pupil Needs served by
Title I Projects
in the five Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas

Needs	SMSA's A	B	C	D	E
Inadequate command of academic subjects	1	1	1	2	1
Inadequate command of language	2	2	2	3	2
Inadequate cultural opportunities	3	-	3	1	3
Speech defects	4	-	5	-	-
Inadequate social opportunities	-	-	6	4	-
Poor health	-	-	7	5	-
Inadequate nutrition	-	-	-	6	-
Others	5	-	4	7	4

with only the equipment and supplies then available in their local schools. Specialized equipment often did not arrive until the project term was drawing to a close. Many LEA's in the C and D designation of SMSA reported a shortage of planning time and/or money. Smaller schools found that personnel could not be released prior to receiving Title I funds to implement Title I projects. As a result, personnel were requested to volunteer their time in such planning.

Another problem which many schools noted was the excessive amount of paper work involved. Local people complained that a commitment to federal funds required voluminous reports and accounting. One LEA (SMSA-A) complained that "the cost of professional time required to carry out proposal preparation, budgetary and financial reports is prohibitive." Another LEA (SMSA-C) commented that the "paper work required makes projects burdensome and causes unwarranted consumption of time." A similar problem was noted by a small regional school (SMSA-D). "The reliance of the State Department of Education on local directors to prepare an evaluation of this sort, without remuneration is at least questionable. Neither the local director nor any of his staff should be relied upon to prepare a report of this magnitude without sufficient remuneration."

Several communities had suggestions for changes in the legislation which would alleviate their problems. For example, legislation might provide for more flexibility in budgeting. Legislation should allow LEAs to reimburse their towns for the auditing time of the local treasurer. It might also allow local funds to be used to supplement federal funds in extensions of Title I programs in other areas of the city not now eligible for funds. Legislation could be changed to permit a more satisfactory method of determining the eligibility of participants.

The communities, one in SMSA-A and one in B, strongly recommended changing the ESEA bill from a categorical aid bill to a general aid bill and in turn

placing the responsibility for the administration of the funds at the local level. This attitude is reflected in the quotation which follows.

> "Funds should be used in a more general way. At the present time, while certain projects have been approved by the school system in certain areas, the overall improvement of our school program continues to lag. In some instances, it would seem to me, personally, to do more good for our children in every way if we could take a large amount of our money and upgrade our textbook collection or our science equipment, or to expand our staff in certain patterns.
>
> The total impact of the monies already expended in our system at the same time does not seem to be great. While we conducted our programs only for a few months, there was nothing that carried over. One of the most important items for consideration is the need for some security in the program. At present, I find it almost impossible, if not impossible, to interest people in our system in working in these projects as it is a year-to-year basis and no one seems to know whether or not we will get funds, and if we do get funds, when they will be available. There are far too many gaps in the funding of programs and no assurance that the funds will continue over any period of time. For this reason, people who have the year-to-year security of our regularly established program are rather reluctant, if not downright unwilling, to serve in these programs. This, I think, must be corrected if we are to move ahead. Needless to say, there must be a more simple, direct and efficient way to account for the use of funds and to account for the conduct of the general program. For the relatively small amount of money that we have received under Title I, there has been an inordinately high amount of paper work and detail. If the same amount of paper work and detail were required for the other 7½ million dollars that we spend, we would not be able to conduct the school business, as the clerical overhead would be impossible to maintain. At present, the state gives this city well over one million dollars annually and trusts the local school system for the proper expenditure of these funds. At the same time, our income from federal sources is something around $150,000 and the accounting required for this amount far exceeds any amount which we receive from the state. There is an imbalance here and it certainly needs to be corrected. If we are not capable of responsibly handling the small amounts we get from the federal government, than the federal government should not be dispensing these funds as the program seems to carry with it a basic distrust of the capabilities of local educational agencies."

This quotation may be compared to the one below taken from the report of an SMSA-B city:

> "What problems?"

A compilation of easily classifiable problems by SMSA is found in Table 13.

TABLE 13

PROBLEMS LOCAL OFFICIAL ENCOUNTERED IN IMPLEMENTING PROJECTS

Problems	No. of LEA's in each SMSA reporting problem				
	A*	B	C	D	E
Obtaining qualified staff					
elementary classroom teacher	2	0	1	2	0
elementary reading specialist	2	1	2	1	1
other elementary	1	0	1	0	0
administrators	0	0	1	0	0
counselors	0	0	1	0	0
consultants	0	0	1	0	0
psychologists	1	0	2	0	0
psychiatrists	1	0	1	0	0
social workers	1	0	1	0	0
other	2	1	0	0	0
Equipment/materials/supplies not secured in time	2	2	3	2	1
Shortage of planning time/money	0	1	5	4	0
Shortage of personnel to plan project	0	1	1	4	0
Excessive paper work	1	2	1	2	0
Inadequate Title I funds	0	1	3	1	0
Problems in evaluation					
shortage of personnel trained in evaluation	0	1	0	0	0
incomplete knowledge of Title I requirements	0	0	1	0	0
objectives too general for effective evaluation	0	0	0	1	0
not enough money budgeted for evaluation	0	0	0	1	0
Limitations imposed by regulations	1	1	0	1	0
Fiscal accounting	0	1	2	0	0
Designing projects to meet pupil needs	1	0	0	1	0
Completing project applications	0	0	0	2	0
Negative reaction in community to federal funds	0	0	0	1	0
Identifying qualified attendance areas	1	0	0	0	0
Identifying pupil needs	0	0	0	1	0
Cooperating with OEO	1	0	0	0	0

* SMSA - "A" consists of 3 communities
" B " " 3 "
" C " " 14 "
" D " " 10 "
" E " " 3 "

5. **ACTIVITIES FUNDED:**

Academic remediation was the general activity most often funded in each of the five Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas. The specific activity frequently funded was reading and the use of audio-visual aids and small group instruction. The most prevalent activities in each SMSA are listed below. Both the general nature and the specific nature of the activity is listed and all are listed in order of decreasing prevalence. A listing of all activities and their relative frequency in each SMSA is found in Table 14.

Most Prevalent Activities

SMSA	General Activities	Specific Activities
A	1. Academic remediation 2. non-academic enrichment 3. Parent involvement 4. Development and/or improvement of facilities/materials 5. In-service training	1. Diagnostic services 2. Small group instruction 3. Teacher aides 4. Reading 5. Counseling 6. Special grouping
B	1. Academic remediation 2. In-service training	1. Reading 2. Audio-visual aids 3. Teacher aides
C	1. Academic remediation 2. In-service training 3. Parent involvement	1. Reading 2. Audio-visual aids 3. Small group instruction 4. Diagnostic services 5. Individualised instruction
D	1. Academic remediation 2. Academic enrichment 3. non-academic enrichmen	1. Reading 2. Audio-visual aids 3. Diagnostic services 4. Field trips
E	1. Academic remediation 2. Academic enrichment 3. Improvement of facilities/materials 4. non-academic enrichment	1. Audio-visual aids 2. Reading 3. Small-group instruction 4. Self-pacing by student 5. Field trips

TABLE 14

TYPES OF ACTIVITIES FUNDED IN THE FIVE STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS

	Percent of projects employing each activity in the five SMSA's				
	A*	B	C	D	E
GENERAL NATURE OF ACTIVITIES					
academic remediation	46	66	62	78	67
in-service training	31	55	27	28	0
parent involvement	38	33	27	17	0
academic enrichment	15	22	15	33	33
non-academic enrichment	38	11	10	33	33
improvement of facilities/ materials	38	22	15	12	33
non-academic remediation	23	11	15	5	0
SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES					
reading	38	44	42	56	67
audio-visual aids	23	44	27	39	100
small group instruction	38	22	27	17	67
diagnostic services	46	0	27	39	0
field trips	23	22	20	28	67
counseling	31	22	20	12	0
teacher aides	38	33	10	17	0
health services	8	11	23	12	0
library services	8	22	8	12	33
mathematics	15	11	10	5	0
individualized instruction	0	11	27	0	33
recreation	15	11	4	22	0
tutorial arrangements	8	11	8	12	0
preschool instruction	8	0	8	5	0
special grouping	31	0	4	5	0
work-study programs	15	11	4	0	33
social studies	15	0	4	5	0
self-pacing by student	15	0	4	0	67
art instruction	8	11	0	0	33
food services	15	0	4	0	0
vocational education	15	0	0	5	0
health education	0	0	4	5	0
home visits	0	0	4	5	0
television instruction	0	0	0	12	0
music instruction	8	0	4	5	0
science	8	0	0	0	33
after-school study center	0	11	4	0	0
art exhibits and/or music concerts	0	0	0	5	0
reduce class size	8	0	0	0	0
home economics	0	0	4	0	0
other	0	11	8	17	0

* SMSA - "A" consists of 3 communities having 13 projects
" B " " 3 " " 9 "
" C " " 14 " " 26 "
" D " " 10 " " 18 "
" E " " 3 " " 3 "

7. METHODS OF INCREASING STAFF FOR TITLE I PROJECTS:

Some communities in every Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area used in-service training of their current staff to gain the additional staff for Title I projects. The majority of communities also conducted summer projects as another means of increasing staff to meet the needs of their Title I projects. A complete analysis of the methods communities used for increasing their staff for Title I projects may be found in Table 15.

8. MEASURING INSTRUMENTS:

A list of the most prevalently used instruments for each school level is listed below. Due to the small number of projects in any one grade level in any one SMSA, the data presented below are often based only on two or three projects which may be very different from one another in nature.

SMSA	Grade Level	Most Prevalently Used Instruments
A	Pre-Kind./Kind.	Anecdotal records Observer ratings Attendance Interview Stanford Binet I.Q. Test Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test
A	Grades 1-3	Teacher ratings Anecdotal records Botel Work Recognition Test Boston University Test of Hearing Non-standardized Test of Attitudes Durrell-Sullivan Reading Achievement Test Durrell-Sullivan Primary Reading Capacity Test
A	Grades 4-6	Teacher ratings Anecdotal records Non-standardized Test of Attitudes California Test of Mental Maturity Durrell-Sullivan Primary Reading Capacity Durrell-Sullivan Reading Achievement Metropolitan Achievement Botel Work Recognition

TABLE 15

METHODS OF INCREASING STAFF FOR TITLE I PROJECTS

Methods	Percent of LEA's in each SMSA using method				
	A	B	C	D	E
In-service training of current staff	100	67	38	50	33
Extend time of current staff					
after school	0	33	13	20	0
evenings	0	33	0	0	0
Saturdays	0	0	7	10	0
summer school	100	100	63	80	67
Use of lay persons as teacher aides or in assignments not requiring certified personnel	67	33	26	30	0
Use of non-education professional persons (physicians, dentists, etc.)	67	0	13	10	0
Recruitment of teachers who had dropped out of teaching profession	0	0	0	10	0

SMSA	Grade Level	Most Prevalently Used Instruments
A	Grades 7-9	Teacher ratings Stanford Achievement Test Durrell-Sullivan Reading Capacity Durrell-Sullivan Reading Achievement Anecdotal records
A	Grades 10-12	Stanford Achievement Test-Technical Comprehension Anecdotal records Interviews Test of Mechanical Comprehension Manual Dexterity section of the WAIS
B	Pre-Kind./Kind.	No Projects
B	Grades 1-3	Only one project - on Speech Therapy
B	Grades 4-6	California Achievement Test (Reading)Form W and X Durrell-Sullivan Reading Achievement (Forms A and B) Stanford Achievement Test - Intermediate I and II Botel Reading Inventory Teacher ratings
B	Grades 7-9	Teacher ratings Non-standardized Test of Behavior Interviews SRA Achievement Test - Form C and D
B	Grades 10-12	Teacher ratings Interviews Non-standardized Test of Behavior California Phonics Survey Gates Reading Survey Revised Beta and Otis Mental Abilities Test
C	Pre-Kind./Kind.	Metropolitan Readiness Test Attendance Teacher ratings SRA Primary Mental Abilities Test
C	Grades 1-3	Durrell-Sullivan Reading Capacity Test Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty California Achievement Test Non-standardized Test of Achievement Non-standardized Test of Attitude Gates Achievement Test Metropolitan Achievement Test Anecdotal records

SMSA	Grade Level	Most Prevalently Used Instruments
C	Grades 4-6	Teacher ratings Anecdotal records Durrell-Sullivan Reading Capacity Test Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty California Achievement Test Non-standardized Achievement Test Iowa Basic Skills Test
C	Grades 7-9	Teacher ratings Anecdotal records Non-standardized Test of Attitudes Nelson Silent Reading Test - Form A and C Doren Diagnostic Reading Test SRA Reading Test
C	Grades 10-12	SRA Reading Test Teacher ratings
D	Pre-Kind./Kind.	Only one project
D	Grades 1-3	Durrell-Sullivan Reading Achievement Test Anecdotal records
D	Grades 4-6	Durrell-Sullivan Reading Achievement Test Anecdotal records Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulties
D	Grades 7-9	California Achievement Test Cooperative Tests - Subject Area Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulties Iowa Test for Basic Skills
D	Grades 10-12	Only one project
E	Pre-Kind./Kind.	No projects
E	Grades 1-3	SRA Mental Abilities Test Attendance Teacher observation
E	Grades 4-6	SRA Mental Abilities Test Attendance Teacher observation
E	Grades 7-9	No projects
E	Grades 10-12	No projects

9. Missing - forthcoming in addenda

10. Missing - forthcoming in addenda

PART III TABULAR DATA

TABLE I

The Number of Projects* in Skill Development Subjects and Attitudinal and Behavioral Development that Employed of the Specified Types of Measures.

rojects in:	Skill Development Subjects					Attitudinal & Behavioral Development				
easures	Pre-K/ Kind.	Grades 1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	Pre-K/ Kind.	Grades 1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12
. Standardized Tests and Inventories										
. Achievement	0	15	20	12	5	0	0	1	1	0
. Intelligence	2	3	4	2	3	0	1	1	0	0
. Aptitude	2	1	2	0	1	0	1	2	1	0
. Interest	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
. Attitude	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
. Others: Harris Test for Lateral Dominance; Frostig Evaluation for Visual Perception; Bender Gestalt; Kraus-Weber Strength Test; Boston Univ. Test of Hearing	0	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
. Other Tests										
. Locally Devised Tests	0	0	2	4	1	0	2	2	0	0
. Teacher Made Tests	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
. Others (Specify)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
. Other Measures										
. Teacher Ratings	3	5	7	8	2	0	1	2	1	0
. Anecdotal Records	2	5	6	3	1	1	2	3	1	0
. Observer Reports	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
. Others: Attendance	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
Interviews	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0

Tabulation represents all Rhode Island projects

TABLE 2 A

Summary of Effectiveness for Types of Projects+

Remedial Reading Programs

ool Level	PRIMARY OBJECTIVE*			SECONDARY OBJECTIVE **		
	Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress Achieved	Little Progress Achieved	Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress Achieved	Little Progress Achieved
eschool	0	0	0	0	0	0
ades 1-3	7	8	0	7	7	0
ades 4-6	13	11	0	12	11	0
ades 7-9	10	5	0	6	9	0
ades 10-12	0	1	0	1	0	0
Totals***	30	25	0	26	27	0

Twenty-seven Title I projects in Rhode Island were Remedial Reading Projects. No other type of project included enough cases to make a meaningful analysis. Four projects might be termed health services, four in cultural enrichment, three preschool projects and two tutorial programs. All other types have single cases only.

All projects included in the above analysis had one of two primary objectives: 1) to improve reading performance as measured by standardized achievement tests or 2) to improve classroom performance in reading beyond usual expectations.

The secondary objectives of the above projects varied considerably. The secondary objectives of some projects were other achievement objectives, or ability objectives or attitude objectives. Specific examples of the secondary objectives of these projects were 1) to improve classroom performance in other skill areas beyond usual expectations, 2) to improve children's verbal functioning, 3) to change children's attitudes toward school and education, and 4) other objectives related to children's attitudes.

The totals are not an unduplicated count of projects since one project might serve pupils in several grade levels.

TABLE 2B

NUMBER OF PROJECTS REPORTING VARYING SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING THEIR PRIMARY AND SECONDARY OBJECTIVES

JECTIVE	Primary Objective Progress			Secondary Objective Progress		
	Substantial	Some	Little	Substantial	Some	Little
ievement						
improve performance as measured by stan-dized achievement test	3	1	0	0	0	0
improve classroom performance in reading ond usual expectations	9	14	0	0	1	0
improve classroom performance in other ll areas beyond usual expectations	1	4	1	3	2	0
er achievement objectives	1	2	0	0	3	0
lity						
improve performance as measured by stan-dized tests of intellectual ability	0	0	0	1	0	0
improve children's verbal functioning	3	1	0	2	3	0
improve children's non-verbal ctioning	0	0	0	1	0	0
er objectives related to abilities	1	0	0	0	0	0
itudes						
improve children's self-image	0	1	0	3	3	1
change (positively) their attitudes ard school	3	0	0	6	5	0
raise their occupation and/or educa-nal aspirational levels	0	0	0	1	0	0
increase their expectations of success school	1	0	0	1	0	0
er objectives related to attitudes	0	1	0	3	3	0
avior						
improve children's average daily endance	0	0	0	0	0	1
improve the holding power of schools	0	1	0			
improve and increase the children's ention span	0	0	0	0	0	0
er objectives related to children's avior	0	1	0	0	0	0
ditions related to learning						
improve the physical health of children	0	0	0	0	1	0
improve the nutritional health of ldren	1	0	0	0	0	0
improve the children's emotional and ial stability and/or that of their ilies	1	1	0	1	0	0
provide adequate clothing for the ldren	0	0	0	1	0	0
er objectives related to learning ditions	3	1	0	1	4	0

TABLE NO. 3

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE AND AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP RATES FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED TO NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS**

	1963-1964						1964-1965						1965-1966					
	Title I Schools			Non-Title I Schools			Title I Schools			Non-Title I Schools			Title I Schools			Non-Title I Schools		
Grade	ADA	ADM	%	ADA	ADM	%	ADA	ADM	%	ADA	AMM	%	ADA	ADM	%	ADA	ADM	%
12th gr.	742	786	94	1236	1315	93	098	1184	92	2091	2255	92	2250	2451	91	2769	2988	92
11th gr.	996	1044	95	1308	1404	94	1073	1150	93	2327	2500	93	2394	2611	91	2933	3149	92
10th gr.	893	947	94	1751	1855	94	1140	1202	94	2349	2514	93	2469	2700	91	3089	3329	92
9th gr.	435	476	91	2233	2450	91	744	805	92	2838	2834	100	2047	2226	91	4111	4388	93
8th gr.	579	608	95	2284	2472	92	1039	1101	94	3241	3446	94	3053	3323	91	3533	3782	93
7th gr.	711	743	95	2354	2491	94	1262	1343	93	3206	3386	94	3119	3387	92	3572	3784	94
6th gr.	780	823	94	2466	2618	94	1038	1090	95	3456	3616	95	5444	5885	92	6011	6398	93
5th gr.	292	306	95	2982	3154	94	629	662	95	4113	4368	94	4472	4765	93	6785	7184	94
4th gr.	320	336	95	3267	3273	94	570	600	95	4340	4606	94	4764	5076	93	6321	6742	93
3rd gr.	612	651	94	2805	2959	94	948	992	95	2876	3015	95	5066	5403	93	5586	5928	94
2nd. gr.	756	799	94	2733	2905	94	94	1011	93	3022	3208	94	4918	5314	92	5519	5896	93
1st gr.	487	523	93	2691	2902	92	727	776	93	3425	3689	92	5689	6255	90	6246	6769	92
Kinder-garten	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	722	845	85	980	1144	85
Special Educ.	-	-	-	112	135	82	-	-	-	173	188	92	707	863	81	954	1144	83

See Attachment for definitions of "Average Daily Attendance" and Average Daily Membership

Purpose: To obtain % of attendance

*% = Percent of Attendance (ADA/ADM x 100)

** Data based on returns from 21 communities

TABLE 4

WORKSHEET FOR DETERMINING DROPOUT RATE*

Month	Membership at Beginning of Month	Transfers		Graduates	Deaths	Dropouts	Membership at End of Month
		IN	OUT				
JULY	1559	0	0	0	0	0	1559
AUGUST	1559	0	0	0	0	0	1559
SEPTEMBER	19,369	101	120	53	0	129	19,286
OCTOBER	19,286	111	152	0	0	118	19,212
NOVEMBER	19,212	117	79	0	1	111	19,167
DECEMBER	19,167	76	77	0	0	79	19,107
JANUARY	20,264	119	85	107	3	114	18,869
FEBRUARY	20,031	88	73	2	0	100	19,926
MARCH	19,926	89	77	0	3	98	19,862
APRIL	18,738	43	32	0	0	75	18,680
MAY	18,680	30	36	0	2	87	18,597
JUNE	18,599	10	162	3666	0	31	1/
TOTALS	//////////	//////////	//////////	3/	//////////	2/	//////////

CALCULATIONS:

Arithmetic Accountability

End of Year Membership	1/	23,419
Number of Dropouts	2/	942
Number of Graduates	3/	3,828
TOTAL		28,189

Annual Dropout Rate = Number of Dropouts Arithmetic Accountability

= 942/28,189

TOTAL = 3%

(0.334)

* Data based on returns from 11 communities

TABLE NO. 5
DROPOUT RATES (HOLDING POWER) FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED TO NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS*

	1963 - 1964		1964 - 1965		1965 - 1966	
Grade	Title I School	Non-Title I School	Title I School	Non-Title I School	Title I School	Non-Title I School
12	12	57	29	54	259	303
11	51	137	131	141	783	419
10	128	116	126	151	805	396
9	4	121	5	92	272	876
8	16	38	7	32	292	725
7	5	22	2	10	244	776
No. of Schools	4	29	4	29	30	36
Total No. of Students	1413	14,349	1349	14,736	10,228	18,138
No. of Dropouts	81	508	95	493	164	591
Dropout Rate	.0028	.0020	.0030	.0020	.0029	.0020

*Data based on returns from sixteen communities

TABLE NO. 6

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS IN TITLE I PROJECT HIGH SCHOOLS CONTINUING EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL COMPARED TO NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS*

	1963 - 1964		1964 - 1965		1965 - 1966	
	Title I Schools	Non-Title I Schools	Title I Schools	Non Title I Schools	Title I Schools	Non TitleI Schools
Total Number of Graduates	1255	2562	1439	3254	1260	3157
Mean Size of Graduating Class	251	233	288	271	180	226
Number of Schools Having 0 - 10% Continuing Grads.	0	0	0	0	0	0
11--20%	1	0	1	0	0	0
21-30%	2	0	2	0	3	0
31--40%	1	3	0	1	0	0
41--50%	0	6	1	7	1	9
51--60%	1	1	1	3	2	3
61--99%	0	1	0	1	1	2
Number of Schools	5	11	5	12	7	14

A Student is considered to continue his education if he enters one of the following, on either a full or part-time basis: Post-Graduate High School Course, Junior College, College or University, Vocation or Technical Institute, or a Nursing School.

*Data based on returns from fourteen communities

TABLE 16

STATISTICAL INFORMATION

Classification	Funds Actually Committed	Unduplicated Count of Children				Average Cost Per Pupil
		Total	Public	Non-Public	Not Enrolled	
A.						
PAWTUCKET	$ 224,902.61	601	525	76	0	374.21
PROVIDENCE	1,203,988.98	8656	6763	1532	361	139.09
WARWICK	134,919.06	479	243	61	175	281.65
B.						
CENTRAL FALLS	65,283.24	307	135	172	0	212.48
CRANSTON	107,398.32	1017	895	119	3	105.60
WOONSOCKET	189,310.79	609	391	185	33	311.18
C.						
Barrington	23,963.00	60	60	0	0	399.38
Bristol	53,281.13	209	150	59	0	254.93
Burrillville	26,526.39	459	368	91	0	57.63
Cumberland	29,123.00	170	121	49	0	171.31
East Greenwich	24,638.22	128	114	14	0	192.49
EAST PROVIDENCE	85,006.36	230	177	53	0	369.65
Johnston	29,298.75	143	0	0	143	204.89
Lincoln	21,931.84	150	111	39	0	146.21
North Kingstown	87,463.32	252	226	12	14	347.08
North Providence	20,260.36	42	43	2	0	450.22
North Smithfield	6,363.30	242	209	33	0	26.29
Smithfield	16,801.17	202	91	45	66	83.17
Warren	35,950.00	198	169	29	0	181.36
West Warwick	51,933.22	589	471	118	0	88.18
D.						
Charlestown	4,050.67	25	25	0	0	161.82
Chariho	7,192.15	19	19	0	0	378.42
Exeter-West Greenwich	14,796.20	81	80	1	0	182.67
Foster-Glocester	6,438.12	102	97	2	3	63.12
Glocester	4,165.71	57	57	0	0	73.09
Middletown	70,722.71	349	346	3	0	202.64
NEWPORT	218,093.38	421	355	66	0	518.04
Portsmouth	88,645.56	299	183	39	77	295.47
Scituate	4,807.90	18	18	0	0	267.11
Tiverton	27,275.98	160	120	40	0	170.48
E.						
Foster	3,876.15	108	108	0	0	35.89
Little Compton	4,087.09	22	22	0	0	185.77
New Shoreham	3,656.30	39	37	2	0	93.76

TABULA DATA

(a) Related to project objectives regarding the five most commonly funded Title I Projects in Rhode Island could not be compiled from the LEA's evaluation report.

APPENDIX

State Guidelines for Evaluation.....	five copies
Contracted Evaluations.....	eight copies
Providence School Department G.I.R.D.....	four copies
Newport School Department, Middletown School Department and Jamestown combined program (to be forwarded at a later date)	